THEOLOGY

A MONTHLY REVIEW

. LII. No. 348 JUNE, 1949

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

Editorial

New Translation of the Bible - - - *George S. Hendry*

A Central College for the Anglican Communion - - - - - *Bishop of Southampton*

Six Labour M.P.s in Sheffield - *Sir Richard Acland, Bart, M.P.*

Heraldic Mottoes from the Old Testament - *H. H. Huxley*

For full list of contents see within.

---

dited by Alec R. Vidler at Windsor Castle, and published
y the S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2.

er copy. 12s. per annum, post free.

U.S.A. $3.60 payable to the Macmillan Co., 60 Fifth Avenue, New York 11 N.Y.

THEOLOGY

Editorial communications should be addressed to: The Rev. Alec R. Vidler, D.D., 8, The Cloisters, Windsor Castle, Berks. (MSS should not exceed 3,500 words, and should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed envelope.)

Business communications (including books for review) to: The S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C.2.

Advisory Committee

Montgomery Belgion
The Rev. Frank Bennett
The Rev. L. J. Collins
The Rev. W. W. S. March
The Rev. Prof. E. C. Ratcliff
The Rev. Prof. Norman Sykes, D.Phil.

Editorial Representative in the U.S.A.: The Rev. W. Norman Pittenger, General Theological Seminary, Chelsea Square, New York City

CONTENTS

		PAGE
Editorial		201
New Translation of the Bible	*George S. Hendry*	203
A Central College for the Anglican Communion	*Bishop of Southampton*	208
Six Labour M.P.s in Sheffield	*Sir Richard Acland, Bart., M.P.*	213
Heraldic Mottoes from the Old Testament	*H. H. Huxley*	216
Correspondence:		
The Ministry	*E. L. Mascall, O.G.S., and Gregory Dix, O.S.B.*	219
The First Word from the Cross	*H. A. Blair*	224
Book Reviews:		
Edward Carpenter, *Thomas Tenison*	*Mark A. Thomson*	225
Oliver Tomkins, *The Wholeness of the Church*	*Frank Bennett*	227
Harold Riley, *The Revision of the Psalter; The Broadcast Psalter;* A Religious of C.S.M.V., *St Athanasius on the Psalms*	*C. W. Quin*	228
F. J. Shirley, *Elizabeth's First Archbishop*	*Thomas M. Parker*	231
E. W. S. Stringer (Ed.), *The Degrees and Hoods of the World's Universities and Colleges*	*Charles A. H. Franklyn*	232
J. F. Wolfenden, *The Public Schools To-day*	*Ronald Lunt*	233
Shorter Notices		234
Books Received		239

THEOLOGY

VOL. LII JUNE, 1949 No. 348

Editorial

"GLORY" is one of the great words of the Bible, and even in common speech it retains a suggestion of majesty and magnificence in an age when most great words have been debased and have lost their power through being exploited in advertisements. This word is, and must ever be, constantly on the lips of Christian men in prayer and worship, in psalmody and hymnody. Yet few of us would find it easy to say just what it means. In any case, when we had said all that could be said, it is a word that would be beyond our powers of definition, since it carries the mind up to the ineffable Being of God. "The glory of all things," says Hooker, "is that wherein their highest perfection doth consist." "The glory of God is the admirable excellency of that virtue divine, which being made manifest, causeth men and Angels to extol His greatness, and in regard thereof to fear Him." Because it has been made manifest, there is much that can be said about it. The heavens declare the glory of God, and the whole creation is penetrated by His glory, so that every creature has its proper and peculiar glory, derived from the glory of God and pointing thither.

Linguistic and critical investigation has thrown a wealth of light on the biblical conception of the glory of God and on all the glories that are derived from that. The word itself in Hebrew and in Greek has a tangled and extraordinary history, and the patient unfolding of this history brings immense instruction to the mind and enrichment to the imagination. Prof. A. M. Ramsey's new book, *The Glory of God and the Transfiguration of Christ* (Longmans, 9s. 6d.), gathering together and appraising the results of much learned research, traces the conception throughout the Bible, and shows how it was expanded to embrace all things and also how at last it was seen to be all summed up in Christ. As he says, the conception of glory illuminates every part of the structure of the Christian faith.

> In tracing the doctrine of the glory we have, almost unwittingly, been disclosing the pattern of the faith of the Bible. The God of the Bible is manifested in His created works, and yet He transcends them all. He rules in history with the sovereignty of His righteous purpose: He showed His glory in delivering Israel to be His people, and though His glory cannot be circumscribed in time or place He set it in the midst of Israel as a tabernacling presence. Again and again He judged Israel for ascribing glory not to Him but to herself; and in the fullness of the times He manifested His glory decisively in the birth, life, death, and resurrection of His Son. Once more He redeemed a people and set the glory of His presence in their midst, a glory

> which faith alone can discern. Again and again He has judge the new Israel for ascribing glory not to Him but to herself And our present discerning of the glory of God by faith is no worthy to be compared to the vision of glory when we shall se Him as He is. In this glory not only redeemed humanity but al creation will share (pp. 82 f.).

The second part of the book is a fresh and fascinating study of th Transfiguration of our Lord both as an historical event and as theme of the Gospel. The way in which the Transfiguration ha been regarded in the life of the Church is also reviewed, its im mense appeal to the Eastern mind, and its comparative neglect i the West. Here the West has much to learn from the East, and th moderns from the ancients. Prof. Ramsey calls attention to severa notable discourses on the Transfiguration both in the Fathers and i the works of English divines. He justly concludes that, although th Transfiguration does not belong to the central core of the Apostoli *Kerygma*, "it stands as a gateway to the saving events of the Gospe and is as a mirror in which the Christian mystery is seen in its unity Here we perceive that the living and the dead are one in Christ that the old covenant and the new are inseparable, that the Cros and the glory are of one, that the age to come is already here, tha our human nature has a destiny of glory, that in Christ the fina word is uttered and in Him alone the Father is well pleased. Her the diverse elements in the theology of the New Testament meet (p. 144).

This is the kind of work on the Bible of which the Church a present stands most in need. So far from deprecating the labour and achievements of the literary and historical critics, it utilizes an continues them. Beyond that, it is an essay in the discovery of th total message of the Bible, and it provides each reader with th materials which will enable him to make the discovery for himself.

* * * * *

Those who have read with profit Mgr Knox's translation of th New Testament will be glad to know that the first volume of hi translation of the Old Testament is now ready—*The Old Testa ment: Genesis-Esther* (Burns Oates and Washbourne, 21s.). We ar glad to publish in this number what we believe is the fullest accoun that has yet appeared of the aims of those who are responsible fo the new non-Roman translation of the Bible upon which work ha recently begun.

New Translation of the Bible

THE project of a new translation of the Bible in modern English, which should receive some kind of official recognition by Churches in this country, was first mooted in the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. It was brought before the General Assembly of 1946 by way of "overture" from one of the constituent Presbyteries of the Church. In this overture the submission was made that "the language of the Authorized Version is archaic and has become largely unintelligible to the people, and the work of the Church both in preaching the gospel and in instructing the young is gravely impeded in consequence"; and the General Assembly were asked to initiate measures for the preparation of a new translation of the Bible in the language of the present day which might be authorized for use in public worship and instruction.

The overture was inspired by the evangelical motive of desire that the gospel should be communicated to the people of our time in language they can readily understand. At that time, it will be remembered, the Churches were particularly concerned with the problem of evangelism. The Church of England Report, *Towards the Conversion of England*, had lately been published, and a similar report, entitled *Into All The World*, was laid before the General Assembly of 1946 by a Committee of their own. Both reports bore witness to the urgent necessity of presenting the gospel to the large pagan, or semi-pagan, masses in our midst, and both discussed ways and means by which it might be done more effectively. In the Scottish report it was argued that one of the main difficulties in evangelism is the gulf which separates the language in which the Church is accustomed to clothe its message from that of those whom it seeks to address. "The terminology which the evangelist naturally employs has almost no meaning for those whom he wishes to address. He seems to them to be speaking in a foreign language and using words which convey nothing to their minds."

This difficulty is not to be met by appeals to ministers and clergy to simplify the language they use, as if it had its root in an arbitrary predilection for obscurity on their part; it has its root in the language of the Bible. For the message which the Church has to proclaim is the message of the Bible, and the language of the Church cannot but take its colour, to a large extent, from the language of the Bible.

The difficulty presents itself most acutely to those whose duty it is to teach the Bible in school. The present writer can testify from many years' experience as a school chaplain (a position which in Scotland enables its holder to take an active part in Bible teaching) that the language of the A.V. constitutes a formidable barrier between the child and the message of the Bible, and he has often been distressed to find how much of the precious half-hour that might be spent in imparting the message has to be wasted in explaining the meaning of the words in which it is couched. The difficulty was felt also by chaplains to the Forces, and I have heard of cases where an

awakened interest in the Christian gospel was severely damped when the men tried to read the Bible, as their chaplains had encouraged them to do. It was significant that the Church of Scotland thought it desirable to provide its army chaplains with copies of a well known modern version of the New Testament for distribution among the troops. Ministers and clergy who have conceived a deep attachment to the A.V. may deplore this, but it cannot be gainsaid that to those of our people who have not had more than an elementary schooling in language and literature there is much in the A.V. which is quite unintelligible. Moreover, there is no valid theological reason why the Church should insist that the people of the twentieth century should receive the Word of God in the archaic language of the seventeenth. However much we regret the fact that our people are now, for the most part, unable to appreciate the splendours of this language and that their own speech is threadbare in comparison, the Church's task is not to promote literary appreciation but to proclaim the Word of God, and the Church must not hesitate to draw the implications of its faith in the Incarnation and boldly clothe the word of the gospel in the vesture of our common speech.

Those were the main considerations which led the General Assembly to take action. The Assembly approached the authorities of the larger Christian communions in the United Kingdom and suggested that if they were disposed to favour the proposal they should appoint delegates to confer informally and see if an agreed plan of action might be recommended. All the Churches agreed to the suggested conference and appointed delegates who met in London in the winter of 1946-47. Agreement on the desirability of a new version was quickly reached, and discussion centred on the question whether it should take the form of a fresh revision of the old version or whether a completely new translation should be attempted. The American Bible Committee had chosen the former alternative, and had recently published the first instalment of their labours in *The Revised Standard Version of the New Testament*. (It was known also that a proposal for revision of the R.V. had been made by a group of scholars in this country about ten years earlier and a certain amount of preparatory work had been done before it was interrupted by the war; the scheme was eventually abandoned.) The American R.S.V., which has been favourably received on the whole in this country,[1] probably represents the utmost length that can be gone in revising the A.V. while conserving its fundamental style and manner. It was generally agreed, however, that it does not go far enough to meet the need of the present day in this country and on purely literary grounds there are serious objections to the idea of a twentieth-century revision of a seventeenth-century classic. The revision inevitably invites comparison with the original, and men say, "The old is better"—as the fate of the R.V. should warn

[1] It has been the object of savage attack from fundamentalist quarters in America.

us. Any attempt to modernize such a genuine antique as the A.V. is likely to produce the suspicion of a fake. We cannot affect the style of the seventeenth century in the twentieth—and there is no reason why we should. On the contrary, a revision of the A.V., merely purged of errors and archaisms and retaining, or attempting to retain, the archaic flavour of the original, would be prone to foster the impression, already present in many minds, that the *message* of the Bible belongs to a bygone age and has no relevance to the world of the twentieth century. The urgent evangelistic and educational tasks confronting the Churches in this country call for a new translation in which the Word of God will be presented to men in the language of the present day.

This was the prevailing view at the preliminary conferences, and evidence that it is widely held is furnished by the multiplicity of new translations of the Bible or the New Testament which have been made by individual scholars on their own initiative during the last two generations. There was a slight and understandable hesitation in accepting this view on the part of the Anglican delegates at these conferences, since it was feared that a new translation in modern English, if read in church, would jar with the language of the Prayer Book. On this matter it may be permitted to a non-Anglican (apart from suggesting the obvious remedy) to remark that he has listened to many sermons in Anglican churches the language of which was very far removed from that of the Book of Common Prayer, and no offence has been taken.

The other question which the delegates at these conferences had to consider was that of publication. Offers had been received from a number of enterprising firms, but it was thought best in the first instance to consult the Oxford and Cambridge University Presses (which had made no approach). Discussions took place with representatives of the University Presses, and a provisional agreement was reached whereby the Presses would undertake the production and publication of the new translation and relieve the Churches of all financial responsibility. The delegates of the Churches resolved accordingly to ask the authorities of their respective communions to approve the proposal and to set up a joint committee to carry out the arrangements in co-operation with the two University Presses.

The authorities of the Churches represented at these conferences all approved the proposal and accredited representatives to the Joint Committee which met in London in July, 1947. The Bishop of Truro was elected chairman. The Committee immediately set about enlarging itself by inviting the support of other Churches, since there had been an understanding from the beginning that if the larger Churches agreed on the proposal, others should be asked to participate. The Committee now includes representatives of all the main branches of the Christian Church in the United Kingdom and Ireland and also of the two principal Bible Societies. The new version will thus enjoy a sponsorship very much wider than that of the A.V., which was confined to the Convocation of Canterbury.

The first task of the Committee was to formulate the principl on which the new translation should be based. These are:

1. The work is to be a new translation, not a revision of the A.V. R.V., having as its object to render the original into contemporary Englis and avoiding all archaic words and forms of expression; the second perso singular pronoun shall be employed only in prayer.

2. Regard shall be paid to the native idiom and current usage of t English language, and Hebraisms, Grecisms and other un-English expre sions shall be avoided; freedom shall be employed in altering the constru tion of the original where that is considered necessary to make the meanin intelligible in English.

3. The translation shall be based on the best ascertainable text (in t judgment of competent authorities), and, where doubt exists, alternati renderings shall be appended.

4. The translation shall be printed in paragraph form; poetical books ar passages shall be printed in verse form; and the modern system of punctu tion, including marks of quotation, shall be employed.

The Committee had next to consider the method to be adopte for carrying out the work. In the history of Bible translation tw methods have been employed, both in ancient and in modern times some translations have been made by individuals, others by tean or groups of scholars working together in committee. There is muc to be said for both methods, and both can point to notable successe The A.V. was the work of a committee. A cynic has described it a the only instance known to history of a miracle wrought by a com mittee of divines. But on the other hand the A.V. was based to very large extent on the previous work of a single individua William Tyndale. And the miracle of 1611 certainly failed to r peat itself in 1885. Both methods have been employed in mo recent times also, and neither without success. The Americans a using the committee method in the preparation of the R.S.V., whil the new translation of the New Testament lately authorized by t Roman Catholic Hierarchy of England and Wales is the work of on man, Monsignor Ronald Knox. At the same time, both metho have their drawbacks. The vast bulk of the Bible makes its tran lation a formidable task for a single individual, and the variety its contents demands a degree of versatility which no single ind vidual is likely to possess. The committee method, on the oth hand, is cumbrous and slow, and committees are apt to be t cautious and to lack that element of boldness and imaginatio which translation often calls for.

Is it possible to devise a method which will combine the meri of each of these and avoid their drawbacks? The Joint Committe at all events, has attempted to do so. It began by setting up thr "advisory and consultative Panels," for the Old Testament, the Ne Testament, and the Apocrypha respectively, and it invited a numb of the foremost Biblical scholars in the country to join them. T task of these Panels is to deal with the many technical problems i volved in the work, especially that of the text, and to supervise t work of the translators. The actual translation is to be done by i dividual scholars who have been appointed by the Committe on t nomination of the Panels. The material has been divided up acco

ing to the familiar classification (in the Old Testament, historical, prophetical, poetical, etc., and in the New Testament, Synoptic, Johannine, Epistolary), and each portion has been assigned to a translator who is an acknowledged expert in that particular branch of Biblical study. The translators will work under the direction of the Panels, by whom their drafts will be examined and, if necessary, sent back for revision. It may be hoped that this method will enable the new translation to give a truer impression of the rich variety of style among the Biblical writings than any existing version does.

The Committee has introduced another and rather novel cog into the machine it has devised. Since its main concern is not to produce a pedantically accurate rendering of the original but to make the Bible intelligible to the modern English reader, as far as may be, it has set up a fourth Panel, whose special responsibility it is to watch over the English of the translation. This Panel of Literary Advisers is composed of men distinguished in English letters. The task of the Literary Panel may well prove to be the hardest of all, but it may at least be expected that they will save the translators from repeating the worst mistakes of 1885.

There are some problems which cannot be solved by translation, however skilfully it be done, and it is well to recognize this at the outset. There are a number of frequently recurring terms which are central to the thought of the Bible but for which there are no precise equivalents in English. How are we to render such words as קדש, משפט, חסד, ברית, *δικαίωσις, ἱλαστήριον, χάρις*?

The most a translator can hope to do is to score a near miss. To try to meet this difficulty it is proposed to add a short glossary containing explanatory notes on the most important of these terms and showing where the meaning which they bear in the thought of the Bible differs from that of the English words chosen to represent them in translation.

A word may here be said on the policy which has been adopted regarding the text to be translated. Neither of the Panels has been able to propound any novel solution to the difficult problems which arise. As regards the Old Testament, the Panel has decided to take as its basis the Hebrew text contained in Kittel's *Editio tertia*, but where one or more of the ancient Versions indicates a text different from the Massoretic Text, a rendering of the underlying Hebrew may be admitted. No hard and fast rule has been laid down, and every case is to be considered on its merits. Wherever the text translated varies from the Massoretic Text, the fact will be noted in the margin. Conjectural emendation will, of course, be resorted to very sparingly and only when all else fails; it will be admitted only when in the *unanimous* judgment of the Panel no intelligible sense can be obtained from the Massoretic Text or any of the ancient Versions. The New Testament Panel did not consider that any existing text could be taken as the sole basis of the translation, and they have resolved, like their American counterparts, to adopt the eclectic principle; they will judge each variant reading on its merits, and

they also propose to consider the evidence of the ancient Versions as of equal account with that of Greek MSS.[1]

Regret has been expressed in some quarters that it has not been found possible for the British and American Committees to join forces in the production of a single new version which would be common to both the great branches of the English-speaking family. But the differences in aim and method between the two bodies, referred to above—the reasons for which have been discussed and are sympathetically understood on both sides—are too deep to permit this dream to be realized. Nevertheless, friendly relations have been established between the two Committees; the Americans have generously put the first draft of their revision of the Old Testament at the disposal of their British counterparts, and arrangements are being made for the interchange of comment and criticism between the two groups of scholars.

It is scarcely necessary to add in conclusion that the completion of the new version will be a work of years. How many, it is impossible to estimate at this stage. The Committee has endeavoured in every case to secure the best scholars available, and these are usually the most heavily burdened with other work. Translation has only begun, and it will be easier to estimate the time required for completion when the work is further advanced and the rate of progress can be measured. In the meantime the Committee asks the earnest prayers of all the Churches in behalf of those who are engaged in this great and urgent task.

GEORGE S. HENDRY.

A Central College for the Anglican Communion

THE American, African, Indian, Chinese, and Japanese bishops who were recently to be encountered in the streets of London showed, for all men to see, that the Anglican family of Churches embraces in its membership peoples of the East and the West both within and beyond the borders of the British Commonwealth, and were a witness to the astonishing growth of indigenous Churches in communion with the see of Canterbury during the last hundred years.

The rights and regional autonomy of these Churches are defined in Article XXXIV to the effect that "Every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done unto edifying." And as a commentary on this, Bishop Creighton wrote: "Local Churches have no power to change the Creeds of the Universal Church or its early organization. But they have the right to determine the best method of setting forth to the people the contents of the Christian Faith. They may regulate rites

[1] The text of the Apocrypha presents special problems of its own, and the Apocrypha Panel has not yet reached a decision on all of them. The matter being thus *sub judice*, nothing can be said about it here.

ceremonies, usages, observances, and discipline for that purpose, according to their own wisdom and experience and the needs of the people."[1]

In spite of the appalling predicament in which Churches such as those in Burma and China, Korea and Japan find themselves at the present time, all Member-Churches of the Anglican Communion can claim to be vigorously alive, and determined both to develop a truly indigenous Church life, and to strengthen their roots in historic Christianity and their bonds of unity with their sister-Churches.

Successive Lambeth Conferences have given their blessing to the formation of autonomous provinces, and encouraged the increase of an indigenous ministry and native forms of liturgical expression. They have strengthened existing spiritual ties and underpinned historic foundations. With the support of no centralized form of government and no legal basis of union, the structure has been held together by the Conferences themselves, by a common ethos not easily definable but having something to do with a common conception of authority, order, and freedom, and by a common standard of worship. The Book of Common Prayer, simply as a document, cannot for much longer remain a bond or a standard, for uniformity of use has already been abandoned, and provincial liturgies are rightly assuming a character of their own. Liturgical committees in India and Ceylon, for example, are already turning to Eastern models as foundations for their own liturgical expression.

Inevitably, therefore, the Lambeth Conference of 1948 addressed itself to the task of recommending fresh courses of action designed to maintain and develop the solidarity of the Anglican Communion, and not the least promising of the projects in view is that of a Central College.

The idea of such a college has been in the minds of a few for nearly twenty years, and has received the encouragement of successive Archbishops of Canterbury. It was definitely mooted in a letter written by Archbishop Lang to the Chairman of the Missionary Council of the Church Assembly in the year 1934. In 1936 a special committee was formed to prepare a scheme to lay before the next Lambeth Conference which was then expected to meet in 1940, and replies received to a letter sent round to the oversea bishops in August, 1936, were sufficiently encouraging to ensure a favourable reception for the proposal.

The record of the discussions during this period shows the way in which we were being led

The course of training at the College was to be not so much "post-ordination" as "pre-consecration" in character and scope. It was not to be for the men who desired a refresher course in theology and pastoralia but rather for those marked out for positions of authority in their Churches, who would be anxious to equip themselves with deeper understanding of those things which belong to the building of an indigenous branch of the Holy Catholic Church.

[1] *Church and Nation*, p. 212.

The College was not to be the child of any one missionary society nor indeed merely of the Church of England, but was intended to enshrine within its walls the racial and ecclesiastical comprehensiveness of the whole Anglican Communion.

St Augustine's College, Canterbury, came more and more clearly into view as the right place for the Central College, both because it stands in the city of the Mother-See, and because it is itself the architectural and spiritual heir to the Abbey of St Augustine, and is consecrated by a century of missionary service and the offering of the lives of nearly eight hundred men who have been sent out from its midst to serve in the Church abroad.

When the situation was reviewed after the recent war, and the Lambeth Conference again came into view, the recommendation of the Commission on training for the Ministry that missionary candidates should no longer be segregated in separate colleges was a further indication of a new use for St Augustine's. It was, in fact, at this point that we were confronted by the Royal Charter of 1848 which established the college for the training of ordinands to serve overseas, and as it could hardly be claimed that the purpose for which the college was originally founded was now defunct, it became necessary to apply for a Supplemental Charter, which was granted by the King in Council in 1947 and authorizes the admission to the College of clergymen from all parts of the world as well as the admission of ordinands not necessarily pledged to missionary service.

The fact that the College will have a dual purpose has caused misgiving in some minds, but, once it is granted that the advantages of St Augustine's for the Central College outweigh the disadvantages, we shall do well to remember, first, that a Royal Charter is a Royal Charter and must be treated as such; secondly, that changes in the future cannot be foreseen and it may be that in course of time the original purpose will lapse; and thirdly, that it is at least arguable that to have two groups of men, distinct but interminglings may be a happy and fruitful plan. This, only time can show.

The results of the deliberations of the Lambeth Conference are to be found in the Resolution (No. 86) that "in the opinion of this Conference the establishment of a Central College for the Anglican Communion is highly desirable and steps should immediately be taken to establish this College, if possible at St Augustine's College, Canterbury"; and this Resolution is based on the recommendations of the Committee on the Anglican Communion[1] which, for the benefit of readers who do not wish to refer to the Report, may be summed up as follows:

(*a*) The aim of the College would be to provide a place to which men could come for further study in subjects relating to the evangelization of the world, and to the growth and welfare of the life of the Church. It would be a place of scholarship and research with a central library to which Church leaders might turn for accurate information. It would be a centre in which

[1] *Lambeth Conference, 1948*, Part II, pp. 91-92.

men from all parts of the Anglican Communion could meet each other, and in fellowship and guided discussion learn something of the life and ways of the wider Church. It would also provide a centre for conferences, where desired, with visiting representatives from other Communions.

(*b*) The Council of the College must be representative of the Anglican Communion and membership of the Staff open to any suitable member of the Anglican Communion.

(*c*) Care must be taken to see that the College is truly inclusive of the different schools of thought within the Anglican Communion. Students will come not to have their convictions altered but to have their knowledge increased.

(*d*) St Augustine's College, Canterbury, with its historic associations, is the ideal place for the location of the Central College.

The shaping of the studies of that section of the College which will consist of men from overseas will be in the hands of those to whom the fashioning of the destiny of the College is committed. But some sort of a guess, based on previous discussions, of the shape of its activities may be hazarded.

Recalling what was said above that the constituent Churches of the Anglican Communion in developing their regional life with freedom in the regulation of their rites, ceremonies, and discipline, must always do so both with due regard to the present usages and convictions of their sister-Churches and with constant reference to the early formative centuries of the Church, it will be the aim of staff and students to acquire as deep and wide an acquaintance with Anglican Churches other than their own by way of knowledge and of personal friendship, and also to develop and learn to apply a right attitude to Church history. They will strive to understand how the work of the Holy Spirit in the Church has been and is both conservative and creative; how the Living Christ has been doing His works through the centuries and in all parts of the world. A problem, for example, may arise in Church life which is without precedent; and yet with all its newness it is bound up with the past history of the Church, for in the course of that history the Church has faced almost every type of situation and made almost every type of experiment. So a comparative study in Church History will be undertaken which will trace the way in which the Gospel has spread in various ages and environments, and will examine such movements as Gnosticism and the light it throws on modern Theosophy, early asceticism and the Indian sadhu, Emperor worship in the Roman Empire and modern totalitarianism, mass-movements in different epochs and different parts of the world.

A special branch of the comparative study of Church History will be concerned with terms of admission to the Church, the catechumenate, forms of instruction, excommunication and restoration, marriage law and discipline, constitutions and Church government; and a consideration of these things not merely as a collection of rules or enactments, but as the attempt to build up and strengthen local churches, to guard them from error, to establish order, and release a vigorous corporate and personal Christian life.

Comparative studies in Christian worship will be another line emerging from the comparative study of Church History, and will

include the history of Liturgy and attempt to disentangle essential structures from indigenous expressions in vernacular custom, speech, music, and architecture.

These special studies will need a background of research if they are to be kept in touch with reality, historical research, and research into contemporary conditions and experiments all over the world. In matters of order, discipline, worship, and the like, questions constantly crop up in oversea dioceses the answers to which demand a knowledge of what the Church has done in the past and what it is doing elsewhere in the present; and this knowledge is seldom available in the countries in which the questions arise. Several examples were provided by discussions in the recent Lambeth Conference. What are the essential principles embedded in the Book of Common Prayer which, in allowing local variations, must not be tampered with? Can a saint of God who served an East African diocese fifty years ago be canonized? If not why not? How much local custom may be rightly incorporated into the Indian Christian Marriage Service? What is the theology of excommunication? Is there a common practice in different branches of the Anglican Communion in regard to the catechumenate? And how does this practice or variety of practice compare with that of the early Church?

Questions like these come from overseas to the Archbishop, who may refer them to his overseas Advisory Committee, they come to the missionary societies, and they come to personal friends of the oversea bishops. Much valuable help has been given in these ways, but at present it is all rather haphazard and the time has come to build up a home of research to which those who through their isolation are often in great perplexity and in need of help can turn with confidence.

All this study will require three specialists of a somewhat new kind, all thoroughly grounded in their subjects and all ready to approach and apply them in a fresh way. They will need to be patient and resourceful in gathering information from different parts of the world, and sensitive and realistic in regard to practical difficulties on the field.

Assuming that the College grows with a dual purpose, then these three men would devote themselves chiefly to the oversea section, but might well help the ordinands in Church History and Christian Worship; whereas the staff in charge of the ordinands might devote themselves mainly to the teaching of biblical and doctrinal subjects to their men, and be available to help any men from the oversea section who may need help in these subjects.

It only remains to say something about the government of the College, Buildings, and Finance.

The Metropolitans are now being asked to approve the formation of a Council which is to consist of two sections, the first fully representative of the whole Communion, and including all Metropolitans, three members from missionary dioceses not yet included in a province, and eight others from Regional Churches. The second, representing the Church in the British Isles, would serve as the executive

body of the whole Council, and would refer to the whole Council—usually by correspondence—all major matters of policy as well as reports of executive action taken.

The College Buildings suffered from an air raid in May, 1942, and the damage is now being made good. The two beautiful medieval gates and the Pilgrims' Hall lie side by side with buildings of Victorian pseudo-Gothic style which are uninspiring and unsuited to modern college conditions. But plans for remodelling them are in hand, and it is estimated that an expenditure of £20,000 would meet the cost of housing the staff and fifty students in simple comfort, and further sums will be needed for expansion at a later date.

It is obvious that men coming from overseas will have to come with expenses found, and that will mean for each man £200 p.a. for fees and £100 for expenses. For this, assuming the number of students to be twenty-five, £8,000 a year is needed. It remains to be seen what contribution towards this sum the National Churches and missionary societies are able to make. Here is a great opportunity for private donors of vision and imagination. £20,000 would endow a Fellowship for all time, and £10,000 a Studentship. Home dioceses may find themselves able to sponsor one student at a time and let him share in the life of the diocese during the vacations.

Here, then, is a project which by virtue both of the authority which commends it and of its own inherent appeal demands the attention of all who believe in the mission of the Anglican Communion. Immediate pressures and perplexities must not deter us from a far-sighted venture of faith which, translated into action, will greatly enrich the life of the Church.

EDMUND SOUTHAMPTON.

Six Labour M.P.s in Sheffield

IN the summer of last year some of the members of the Parliamentary Socialist Christian Group felt that we should take a little time off from our normal political work and advocacy in order to try to tell people why we believed it important for them to concern themselves with the truth of Christianity. Almost by accidental good fortune it happened that we were already in contact with the Rev. Edward Wickham, the Industrial Chaplain of Sheffield, who arranged for the Bishop of Sheffield to meet us in a committee room at the House of Commons and discuss the possibility of a Parliamentary "Mission." After discussion we agreed (though, perhaps, not quite unanimously) that it would probably be a mistake to aim at the sort of program which worked up to a big public meeting with plenty of local publicity and almost no possibility of effective follow-up. We soon realized that a little week of special effort by a few M.P.s could not profitably be arranged *ad hoc* in any city which we might happen to fancy, and that it could only stand a chance of being

useful if it could somehow be logically fitted, as a mere incident into a steady course of work being undertaken by the Church on the spot.

It was from this point of view that we were fortunate in making contact with the work in Sheffield because, in advance of our visit Wickham was able to fix up a full week's program of mid-day meetings on foundry floors and factory offices, and evening meetings with trade union branches, co-operative groups, and divisional Labour parties. It was significant that when all trade union branches in the city were circulated with an invitation to arrange a meeting in the week, only those responded in which there was at least one Christian contact as a result of his previous work. At the end of our visit, the choice of Sheffield was equally fortunate, because in so far as a few people had been interested by the fact of six M.P.s talking about Christianity, there existed in Sheffield, through the Industrial Chaplain, a fellowship and a program of work in which the interest could be developed.

We drew two main conclusions, and faced one unanswered question as a result of our week.

I do not suppose that there is anything very original about the first conclusion. It was: That it is extremely difficult for industrial workers to be interested in the possibility of Christian truth until someone on behalf of the Church proclaims and explains the social failure of the Church in the nineteenth century, and offers reason to believe that the same sort of failure need not be perpetuated into the future.

We met the challenge in the first question at the end of our first mid-day meeting. The question was not much more than an embarrassed mumble such as many parsons must have heard, but it was quite clear that we were being asked how anyone could be expected to concern himself with the truth of Jesus Christ when the social leadership of the Church had been so regrettable in the last hundred years. Thereafter we found it advisable to forestall this challenge in our own introductory remarks. In the course of our short talks we pointed to the unprecedented social revolution of the last 150 years —so great that a Babylonian would have understood eighteenth century England better than the great-great-grandfathers of Sheffield steel-workers would understand the England of to-day. We compared this with the relatively smaller social changes which took place in the fifteenth-seventeenth centuries between the dead end of feudalism and the first days of individualism—changes which were accompanied (part as cause and part as consequence) by the Reformation which shook the Church to its foundations. From this it followed that there is need now for a Reformation not less profound but more profound than that which took place three and four hundred years ago.

From this point we had the advantage of talking to people who knew something about the ways of big organizations—namely, the Trade Unions. We could ask them, from their own knowledge, how they would expect such a reformation to take place; and it was

within their knowledge that it could hardly be expected to happen under the smooth and harmonious leadership of the men "at the top" of the organization. They were ready to see that a New Reformation must work from the bottom upwards and not from the top downwards, and that it must be a process in which, first in time, the old ways must sink into innocuous desuetude so that, thereafter, the new ways might be discerned. We could then go on to tell them that in asking for their interest in the Christian truth we were not inviting them to come in and sustain the "Churchianity" which was so widespread in the nineteenth century and which they see surviving in some twentieth-century parishes; on the contrary, we were inviting them to join with each other, and with Wickham, in pioneering for the new Church—the fellowship of men and women under God which would make sense against the entirely new social background of our day and generation.

It was and is, of course, something of an impertinence for Members of Parliament to talk in this way of the Church; what we said may not have been the right answer to the challenge or the right way to forestall it, and in judging of its effect we may have been influenced by wishful thinking. But it appeared that our argument made a difference. Until hearing this argument, it is only a slight exaggeration to say that men listened to two or three M.P.s talking Christianity in their lunch hour much as they might have come to see two or three monkeys performing tricks; after hearing the case for the Church presented in terms of the need for a New Reformation it seemed that some listened with the idea that they were possibly hearing about something that would make a difference.

Our unsolved problem related to the connexion between Christian faith and the workaday world of here and now. There is a connexion, and we felt that after all our words had been forgotten the mere fact of six Labour M.P.s talking about Christianity might persuade a few people to look for the connexion and perhaps rightly to find it. But how were we to express it? We could start by talking either about our own problems as M.P.s, or about the problems of our audiences as industrial workers; we could try to sort out the best from the worst in our social aspirations or in theirs; we could challenge any easy social optimism by reminding them of tens of millions of coloured workers far worse off than themselves; we could carry them with us in arguing that greater social justice, better housing, and so forth are worth while only if they serve as the means towards nobler living, greater fellowship, and more love between man and man. But then what . . . ? At first sight it seemed a simple matter to say that there could be no greater, nobler fellowship unless subordinate to the belief in God's truth; there were some who would follow us with interest when, on this point, we suggested a parallel between the Christian doctrine of Original Sin and some of modern psychology's discoveries about inborn ego-centricity. But in all this we felt all the time that we were in the gravest danger of recommending, in effect, a little dab of Christian enthusiasm as a useful

device for helping us to achieve the social objectives on which we have set our hearts. We found no satisfying answer to this difficulty.

Since our visit to Sheffield, which was in October, the Amsterdam Conference has possibly provided an answer. Supported by the weight of Christian authority gathered at Amsterdam, I believe that it is perhaps possible to take the grave risk of believing that it is part of God's purpose for us now that we should try to find out what is the true essence of democratic government and democratic living, and strive to do those things which need to be done if it is to be sustained in face of the world-wide challenge of our times. If this is a wrong conclusion, all else that we say will be false and ineffective; but if it be a right conclusion, I believe that it enables us to relate the Christian truth to social purposes without so great a danger of finding ourselves in the position of calling up a little Christian fervour to help us with our own private plans.

Our last conclusion arising from our visit was an administrative one, and I do not think that it was wholly conditioned by all the kindness we had from Edward Wickham and his colleague, the Rev. Leslie Hayes. It was: That the Church should spare the resources, chiefly of manpower, but to some extent also of finance and accommodation, in order to train a larger number of Industrial Chaplains to work in other industrial cities and dioceses.

To take an example from our week's work, after a meeting organized by an A.E.U. branch, a regional officer of the Union offered to co-operate in providing opportunities for the same sort of thing to be said in other A.E.U. branches in the neighbourhood; administratively speaking, such an opportunity could be pursued only by one who has authority to follow it up all over a whole city. In addition, our work in Sheffield was easy; we merely talked to groups who had been persuaded by previous Christian effort to come and listen to us talking in their factories. To make the first entry into a factory, and to persuade anyone to come and listen there to the possibility of Christian truth, is a specialized and difficult task needing special ability, special training, and apprenticeship.

RICHARD ACLAND.

Heraldic Mottoes from the Old Testament

THE Bible has for a long time been a favourite source of heraldic mottoes. These have generally appeared in the Latin version of St Jerome, though sometimes the spirit rather than the letter of the old translation has been followed, the individual variations being due for the most part to the desire for brevity and the heraldic weakness for punning.

The mottoes selected for notice here comprise, one need hardly say, only a small fraction of the material available. They are drawn from the coats-of-arms of ancient families, towns, schools, colleges,

universities, and finally—an important element—civic guilds, crafts, and corporations. The British universities whose arms bear Old Testament mottoes include Oxford, Durham, Aberdeen, Nottingham, Wales, Leeds, and Liverpool, and two university colleges, Hertford College, Oxford, and Royal Holloway College, London. Among the schools represented are Abingdon, Bloxham, Canford, Douai, Owen's, Sutton Valence, and Wellington, to name only a few. Civic arms in this category are many and include Westminster, Holborn, Romford, Plymouth, Stourbridge, Keswick, Halifax, Dewsbury, and Caithness. The remainder is made up, apart from the city companies, of institutions as diverse in character as a Masonic Lodge, the Royal Central Asian Society, the Metropolitan Water Board, and the British Association. A number of these coats-of-arms contain in the charges on the shield pictorial references to the Old Testament which the motto frequently elucidates. An obvious example is the Burning Bush depicted on the arms of the Church of Scotland. The Latin motto which appears beneath is *Nec tamen consumebatur* ("And the bush was not consumed," Exod. iii, 2). Indirect borrowing from the scriptures is exemplified by the motto of the Worshipful Company of Shipwrights, "Within the ark safe for ever." On the shield is seen, as one would expect, the ark of Noah resting on the swollen waters.

Old Testament mottoes are very unevenly distributed throughout the various sacred books, and the greater part is derived from the Psalms.[1] Of the books of the Law, Genesis is most well represented. The favourite motto from it is undoubtedly *Deus providebit* or its equivalent ("God will provide," Gen. xxii, 8). "Let there be light" (Gen. i, 3) appears in Latin on the arms of Liverpool University and in Hebrew on the cover-page of the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, for it is the motto of the Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning. From the third chapter of Genesis come two appropriate mottoes in English; verse 7 gives the motto of the Needlemakers' Company—"They sewed fig-leaves together and made themselves aprons"; verse 19 that of the Gardeners—"In the sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat thy bread." "Be strong and of good courage" (Josh. i, 6—motto of the family of Beddington); "Faint yet pursuing" (Judges viii, 4—motto of the family of Dickinson); and *Per meum Deum transilio murum*—"By my God do I leap over a wall" (2 Sam. xxii, 30—motto of the family of Yorke) are three examples from the so-called "Early Prophets." Among mottoes derived from the "Later Prophets" (to use the Hebrew classification) are "In quietness and confidence shall be your strength" (Isa. xxx, 15—Salisbury Diocesan Training College); "One Heart, One Way" (Jer. xxxii, 39—Stourbridge; and, in Latin, Lord Amherst and others), and *Et plui super unam civitatem* (Amos iv, 7—"I caused it to rain upon one city"). This last is fittingly the motto of the Metropolitan Water Board.

Many excellent mottoes could be quoted from the remaining

[1] These are discussed by me in an article which is to appear in the *Evangelical Quarterly*, October, 1949.

books of the Bible. Here is a typical selection: "Yet in my flesh shall I see God" (Job xix, 26—motto of the family of Surman); "Do it with thy might" (Eccles. ix. 10—Viscount Cowdray and others); *Et augebitur scientia*[1]—"And knowledge shall be increased" (Dan. xii, 4—University of Leeds), and "Commit thy work to God" (Prov. xvi, 3—Earl of Caithness and Caithness County Council).

Nor are the apocryphal writings neglected. *Benedicite fontes Domino*—"O ye fountains, bless ye the Lord"—is the motto of the family of Twells and the Borough of Buxton. In the Vulgate it appears in Dan. iii, 77; in the Apocrypha as verse 55 of "The Song of the Three Holy Children"; and in Morning Prayer in the canticle *Benedicite*, a reference to which will show that it is used punningly by the family of Twells. "Honour Wisdom" (Wisdom vi, 21) appears on the arms of Queen's School, Chester. Farnham (Quebec) has for its motto *Bonorum laborum gloriosus est fructus* ("Good labours have fruit of great renown"—Wisdom iii, 15). Finally, from Wisdom xi, 20 comes the motto of the British Association, *Sed omnia disposuisti* ("But thou didst order all things" [sc., "By measure and weight"]).

In a brief sketch such as this much has perforce to be omitted or glanced at in passing. Punning mottoes form a class by themselves, and we know well that the pun may be verbal or pictorial or both. A good example is the coat-of-arms of Hertford College (formerly Hart Hall) with its Latin (though not Vulgate) motto from the Psalms, meaning "As the hart panteth after the water-brooks." Horace's warning, "I labour to be brief; I become obscure," must be borne in mind by all who have to do with the choosing of mottoes. Brevity is to be sought, but clarity is imperative. Wherever possible the motto selected should be relevant to the nature or purpose of the institution whose shield it adorns. Here a lesson may be learnt from the coats-of-arms of the guilds, in which we see that vocation was held to be the way of life to which God had called the guildsmen and that to Him was offered up the skill of hand and eye. In conclusion, I would plead that Biblical mottoes selected for secular institutions (with the possible exception of schools and universities) should be expressed in English and not merely so but in a living idiom. In this way will be enlisted perpetual witneses to the Word of God.

H. H. Huxley.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Dr Hendry is Professor-elect of Systematic Theology in Princeton Theological Seminary, N.J., and was until recently Minister of Bridge of Allan, Stirlingshire, and Secretary of the Joint Committee on New Translation of the Bible.

Sir Richard Acland, Bart., is Member of Parliament for Gravesend.

Mr Huxley is Lecturer in Latin in the University of Leeds.

[1] Discussed by me in *University of Leeds Review* for June, 1948.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE MINISTRY

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

I have no authority to speak on behalf of the writers of the volume entitled *The Apostolic Ministry*, but, with reference to Mr Pittenger's article in the April issue of THEOLOGY, I would venture to suggest that the fundamental line of division in the contemporary discussions about the ministry does not in fact lie between those, on the one hand, who conceive the ministry as having some existence or reality apart from the Church and those, on the other, who conceive it as functioning for the Church, or for Christ in his Church, but as possessing no "ontological status" in his Body. The ultimate division, as I see it, is between those who look upon the Church in which and for which the ministry functions as being simply the Church militant here on earth and those who look upon it as consisting of all those who have been baptized into Christ, whether in this present world they be held still in the flesh or being delivered from the body have passed into the world which is to come. The view which has been widely canvassed in recent years, that in a divided Christendom all orders are to some degree invalid (a view to which the late Dr Quick gave theological expression in his book *The Christian Sacraments*), with its corollary that a fully valid ministry can be recovered only by pooling the fragments in some rite of mutual recognition and commissioning, seems pretty clearly to derive from an assumption, whether conscious or merely implicit, that the Church in which and through which a minister receives his ordination is simply the contemporary earthly Church. Such a tacit limitation of the extent of the Church may be surprising, but that it comes not unnaturally to the twentieth-century Christian mind may be seen in the way in which the Lambeth fathers, in their recent encyclical, unreflectively characterized the Church as "the instrument of the living God for the setting-forward of His reign *on earth*," a description which virtually ignores both the existence of the Church expectant and triumphant and also the supra-mundane concern of the Church militant. Now the traditional doctrine of the ministry that a man either is or is not a priest, and that validity does not admit of degrees, is precisely congruous with the doctrine that the essence of the Church is the glorified human nature of Christ, in which all the generations of the redeemed coinhere and which no human divisions can impair. It is, I think, rather remarkable that those who are most vociferous in maintaining that there is no priesthood save that of Christ, and that it cannot be manipulated by men as their own vested interest, should be as anxious as they are to assert that Christ's exercise of His priesthood in the Church on earth is mutilated and partly invalidated by our human divisions.

It is important to emphasize that the real point of the apostolic

succession is not that it gives the Church militant of to-day continuity with the Church militant of the past, but that it gives it continuity with the Church expectant and triumphant of to-day. The twelve Apostles are not the no-longer-existing initial stage of a process which is still going on; they are the perpetually persisting foundation in which the present ministry inheres. Once this point is grasped the tiresome and inconclusive discussion whether the Apostolate was intended by Christ to be a permanent element in the Church is seen to lose most of its meaning; the Apostolate *is* a permanent element in the Church, because in the glory of heaven the twelve Apostles still exist. And unless we are to suppose the Church militant and the Church triumphant to be two mutually isolated societies this perpetual Apostolate must be relevant to us. And if it is relevant to us, how shall we expect to find it mediated if not through the ministry which has consistently claimed to be in organic unity and continuity with the Twelve? The apostolic succession, if it is a fact at all, is, of course, historically considered a chronological sequence, but its importance lies not primarily in the fact that it is a "link with the past" (that would be mere ecclesiastical antiquarianism and romanticism) but in the fact that it is the foundation of a real unity between the Church on earth and the Apostolate in heaven.

If there is any truth in all this, the common proposal to accept as a basis for reunion the historic episcopate as a fact without any interpretation is totally inadequate. For to accept a historic entity as a fact and nothing more is in effect to accept it purely for its historicity—that is to say, purely for its relation to a past which no longer exists. It is as impossible to accept episcopacy simply as a fact as it is to accept the Church simply as a fact. We have come to see more and more clearly in recent years that the Church is not merely a historical phenomenon but an ontological and eschatological reality. What is true of the Church must be true of all its organs, and unless we discuss the theology of the ministry and the Apostolate in ontological and eschatological terms our understanding of them will be totally inadequate.

Yours sincerely,
E. L. Mascall, O.G.S.

Christ Church,
Oxford.
April 8, 1949.

To the Editor of Theology.

Sir,

May I intrude into the private fight of Mr Kemp and Dr Sykes?

Dr Sykes seems to be doing a notable service to the Catholic cause in Anglicanism by helping to discredit the golden legend of the Caroline Bishops, who were certainly over-idealized in the later nineteenth century, both as theologians and as Anglicans. Some of us have for years past been upbraiding the High Church Party for

putting upon the appeal to Anglican formularies and the seventeenth-century divines a weight which it cannot bear without serious distortion of the evidence, historical and liturgical. Whatever his motives, it is encouraging to find the Dixie Professor reinforcing the so-called "extremists" on this important matter.

As Dr Sykes rightly says: "It was upon the basis of—[let me, for accuracy's sake, interpolate 'some of']—the Anglican divines of the seventeenth century that an earlier Primate, William Wake, proceeded in his policy of formal authorization of intercommunion with the foreign reformed churches." (Wake had another rather cloudy scheme for "authorizing intercommunion" with the very unreformed Roman Catholics of France.) But that "policy" remained a personal ideal, and never received "formal authorization"—for the same reason that a similar scheme came to grief in the time of Wake's predecessor, Tenison. This earlier negotiation was between King Frederick I of Prussia and Archbishop Sharp of York, Tenison himself holding somewhat aloof from it. But the reason for its eventual failure was stated succinctly by the Prussian Ambassador in London, Bonnet, who wrote to his master early in the negotiations (March 17, 1711) that the design was unlikely to succeed because:

> *"On est ici pour l'Episcopat, qu'on regarde du moins comme d'institution Apostolique. La pluspart du Clergé est ici dans la prévention qu'il y a une succession non interrompue depuis les Apôtres jusques à présent; et suivant cette supposition ils prétendent qu'il n'y a point de bon gouvernement Ecclésiastique que celui où il se rencontre des Evêques de cet ordre, ni des véritables ministres de l'Evangile que ceux qui ont été ordinés par ces Evêques."*[1]

That this really was then the view of *la pluspart du Clergé*, as this cool and impartial observer reported, seems plain enough if one turns for a moment from the diplomatic preoccupations of bishops to the publications of contemporary scholars and to the standard works of the time. I will be content here with illustrations from two books by divines representative, and even eminent, in this period, both of which went through many editions about this time, since they were both generally used in the professional training of all the eighteenth-century clergy (*i.e.*, they were something like the "Procter and Frere" and the "Bicknell" of the period).

The first is the famous *Rational Illustration* of Charles Wheatly, the original title of which was *The Church of England Man's Companion*. The first of many editions appeared at Oxford in 1710, the year before Bonnet wrote to King Frederick. Wheatley sets this question of the necessity of Episcopal ordination in the forefront of his teaching. On "The First Rubric" [*i.e.*, in the Prayer Book] he writes of

> ". . . the necessity of a divine commission in order to the being a minister in the Christian Church. If it be asked, Who may truly be said to have this divine commission? we need not doubt to affirm that none but

[1] J. T. Muysson, *Relation des mesures qui furent prises dans les années 1711, 1712 et 1713 pour introduire la liturgie Anglicane dans le Roiaume de Prusse, etc.* London, 1757. P. 27.

those who are ordained by such as we now commonly call bishops, can have any authority to minister in the Christian Church. For that the power of ordination is solely lodged in that order, shall be proved from the institution of our Saviour and the constant practice of the Apostles."

He proceeds to argue from Scripture and the Fathers for some five pages, and concludes:

"And now to sum up all that has been said in a few words, a commission to ordain was given to none but the Apostles and their successors . . . which superior order is the same with that of those we now call bishops; therefore it follows that no others have any pretence thereunto; and consequently none but such as are ordained by bishops can have any title to minister in the Christian Church."[1]

Dr Sykes may object that Wheatly was of a somewhat "High Church" complexion, though the term (which was just coming in) had then a very different connotation. But he will hardly deny that what might be called the contemporary "Low Church" views were adequately represented by Dr Thomas Comber, an exceptionally learned man, a Whig and a friend of Tillotson, who as Precentor of York stoutly opposed the ecclesiastical invasions of James II, and whom William III made Dean of Durham for writing *A Modest Vindication of the Protestants of England who joined with the Prince of Orange*. He was also the author of pamphlets against the Non-Jurors. Comber's *Companion to the Temple and the Closet* is not the pocket prayer book its title might suggest, but a large folio in two parts, of which the 4th edition appeared in London in 1701-2. It was intended to reconcile dissenters to the Church of England, but the method of Reunion by Ambiguities had not yet been perfected, and Comber seems to have had no suspicion of the universal "defectiveness" of all ordinations.

"It is required," he tells the dissenters, "that men be admitted into holy orders by lawful authority, which we affirm to be only that of bishops. And I shall not content myself to prove this by the Statute law of this land [13 Eliz. and 14 Car. II] . . . but show that this law is grounded upon Holy Scripture and the canons and practice of the Universal Church."

After arguments from Scripture and the Fathers, he proceeds:

"But some object this will deprive divers foreign churches, where they have no bishops, of a lawful ministry, because their ministers have no ordination but by presbyters. To which I shall only say that the first presbyter who presumed to ordain had no such power given him, and so could not rightly convey that which he never received; there is no precedent in mere presbyters ordaining alone; and such ordinations would have been declared null in the primitive ages; yea, for 1,500 years together no such were allowed. Their surest plea is that some of these Churches were forced by dire necessity to this irregularity by the obstinate refusal of the Popish bishops to ordain any that were for reformation, so that they either must have such a Clergy as they could have, or have none to officiate in the Protestant way; to which I reply that *where this necessity was real and while it was so, as perhaps it might be in some places at first,* it will go far to excuse them."[2]

[1] *The Church of England Man's Companion*. Ed. Oxford, 1710, Cap. II, § 3 (beginning and end).

[2] Italics mine.

Comber is a representative seventeenth-century divine (he died in 1699) of a firmly Protestant—though not Latitudinarian—kind. But there is nothing here about intercommunion. Is this, with these qualifications of "necessity," the attitude which Dr Sykes would wish us to adopt towards foreign protestants?

Furthermore, is this exactly the "position" which Dr Bell of Chichester has represented as "*The* Anglican Position" before the rise of the Tractarians—and that to foreign scholars who were hardly likely to be able to check his statements for themselves? I would respectfully point out to His Lordship that this particular passage from Comber, with more of the same kind (and nothing contradictory) was reproduced in full, with approbation, in the *Notes* on the Prayer Book first published in 1820 by Dr Richard Mant.[1] The author was afterwards Bishop of Down, but in 1820 he was and had been for some years Domestic Chaplain at Lambeth to Archbishop Manners-Sutton, to whom the *Notes* are dedicated, and whose "considerate condescension and kind but dignified affability" to the author during the book's composition are recorded in the dedication. (The Archbishop is in fact known to have taken a great interest in its compilation.) Such was the teaching considered not only "safe" but "approved" by the Church of England in Lambeth Palace itself two years before Newman was elected to Oriel. No doubt the Olaus Petri Lecturer will be glad to draw the attention of the Swedish Church publicly to this as soon as he has verified it.

To return to Dr Sykes: there is no need to quibble about "Bishop Pearson's attitude" and call for "extracts." I will undertake to see that the full text of Pearson's three *Determinationes* on Ordination is republished with a translation as soon as may be; and if I can find time I will add to them observations on the same topic from some judicious Hanoverian divines, all warranted free from Tractarian influences, with whom I am astounded to conclude that Dr Sykes (of all people!) must have been unacquainted when he wrote certain sentences in his paper. In the meanwhile let us happily agree in continuing to demolish the legend of the Carolines as standards of Anglican orthodoxy. We need not, however, substitute for it a legend that the Tractarians first introduced into the Church of England the doctrine of the necessity of the Apostolic Succession and mistakenly fathered it upon the Carolines. The Tractarians themselves were aware of the unsoundness of many of the Carolines on this point, and cited passages from them contrary to their own doctrine—as any reader of Keble's *Preface* to Hooker or *Tract* 74 can ascertain. It was a section of their successors in the late nineteenth century who over-exalted the Carolines in the effort to find a purely Anglican pattern of Catholicism.

But leave the Tractarians out of the argument, and it remains true that Mant and Wheatly and Comber and a multitude of other Church of England men before and after them did not profess to

[1] *The Book of Common Prayer . . . with Notes, Explanatory, Practical and Historical from Approved Writers of the Church of England.* 1st ed. Oxford, 1820. Pp. 777-8.

have learned of the Apostolic Succession and its necessity either from the court-bishops of the Stuarts and Tudors, or from the Anglican formularies. They learned it and they always argued for it (as can be seen above) not from Anglican authority, but from where the Tractarians found it—in "the doctrine of the Old Testament and the New and that which the catholic fathers and ancient bishops have gathered from that doctrine"—which the first post-Reformation canons of the English Church laid down as the only standard for all Anglican teaching. Ever since "Jewel's Brag" in the very year of Elizabeth's accession, that has been the only final (or intelligible) Anglican appeal and principle. Its prosecution may, indeed, be very inconvenient to some things some Anglicans may sometimes wish to do, and may in other things carry us further than some Anglicans may wish to go. Nevertheless, that appeal to Scripture and to primitive tradition has been made, and it could not now be withdrawn without complete disintegration of all that our own past has made us. All this talk of the personal theories of Bramhall and Wake as a decisive *practical* precedent in a matter on which they do not represent either the mind or the practice of the primitive Church (or, for that matter, of the vast bulk of the Anglican Church then or since, though I do not argue from that) has an unfortunate air of attempting to avoid that fundamental Anglican appeal by erecting an arbitrary barrier in our own past behind which we shall not look. The appeal is not to the Tractarians or Carolines, or the Formularies, but to that to which they all appealed and by which they must be judged—to Scripture and the primitive Church. Few who survey the four centuries of post-Reformation Anglican development will deny that to the slow and fitful but increasing understanding of what that appeal involves we owe most of the fruitfulness and strength (and, I would add, the best justification) of the separate existence of the Anglican Churches.

I am, Sir,
Your servant *in Dno*,
GREGORY DIX, O.S.B.

NASHDOM ABBEY,
BURNHAM,
BUCKS.
April 8, 1949.

THE FIRST WORD FROM THE CROSS

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

Mr Dammers' note on Luke xxiii, 34a, in your April number, needs a reply.

The first word from the Cross is omitted from St Luke's Gospel by the Codex Vaticanus, by the earliest corrector of Sinaiticus, by the Codex Bezæ (though included in the margin), from "family Θ" (Cæsarea), from some but not all of the eastern MSS, and from two Old Latin MSS. But the reading is found in Irenæus (Asia Minor was his background), Tatian, Hippolytus, and Origen amongst

he fathers: it also has direct support from the Codex Sinaiticus tself, C. Alexandrinus, C. Ephræmi rescriptus, C. Regius Parisienis, the Curetonian Syriac, and the Armenian, and from two other Old Latin MSS considered by Streeter to be near to the oldest Roman text. Westcott and Hort regarded the half verse as an uthentic utterance but not part of the original text of St Luke.

It used to be supposed that scholars of the early Church were all oo ready to interpolate, but reluctant to excise. But that can no onger be maintained: "Christian scholars of Alexandria were as much alert as Hort to rid the text of interpolations. . . . And that here were Christian scholars outside Egypt who adopted the Alexndrian principle we have abundant evidence" (Streeter, *Four Gospels*, p. 123). Streeter also quotes a suggestion by Dr Rendel Harris, that the deletion of the half-verse may have been made by a Christian "who found it hard to believe that God could or ought to 'orgive the Jews": there are many Christians to-day who hold the ame views on slighter provocation. That would account for a possible excision in Syria or Palestine, which would be in keeping with the manuscript evidence. Streeter observes that it certainly did not seem as if the Jews had in fact been forgiven (*op. cit.*, p. 138 f.).

In the second part of his note Mr Dammers argues that we ought not to want to retain the logion. To a person who has hurt one without knowing, one should not express forgiveness: therefore our Lord would not have expressed forgiveness to the Roman soldiers. I have looked through various commentaries on the passage—ancient ind modern—and I have yet to discover a commentator who restricts the force of our Lord's words to the soldiers who were crucifying Him. His forgiveness extended to the Jews (cf. Acts iii, 17), to us sinners who crucify Him daily, and even to the heavenly archons—for if they had known the mystery "they would not have crucified the Lord of Glory" (1 Cor. ii, 7, 8).

Furthermore, He was not saying "It's quite all right really." He was praying to the Father on their behalf, as Stephen prayed later. That is surely why Stephen did so. Each of them prayed aloud—and each prayer struck home to at least one listener—our Lord's to a malefactor, and Stephen's to a Pharisee. Through it they learned to know what they had done, as we all must learn; and having learned they repented and were forgiven.

Yours sincerely,
H. A. Blair.

Winterbourne Earls Vicarage,
Salisbury.
April 2, 1949.

BOOK REVIEWS

Thomas Tenison. By Edward Carpenter. S.P.C.K. 30s.

About English ecclesiastical history between the Restoration and the death of Anne we know deplorably little, not because sources of information are wanting, but because they have not been explored.

Dr Carpenter's book is a timely reminder both of what can be discovered and of what yet remains to be done. Tenison, like every person of prominence in his time, was the target for a good deal of abuse. Swift, as might be expected, was responsible for "the most unkindest cut of all," when he wrote that Tenison "was a very dull man who had a horror of anything like levity in the clergy" and that "he was hot and heavy like a tailor's goose." One cannot help feeling that Overton was influenced by this judgment when he described Tenison in 1885 as "an honest and sensible, a solid and stolid, but by no means a brilliant man." Two years later Abbey took much the same line and observed that Tenison's "excellences . . . were not of the brilliant kind." Now Dr Carpenter, who has used the Tenison MSS and other important sources, has at last provided information on which a fairer judgment of Tenison can be based.

Probably the first thing that will strike Dr Carpenter's readers is that Tenison had a much stronger personality than they had suspected. In spite of Swift's gibe, Tenison's contemporaries were aware of this. He was much more than the respectable mediocrity that since his death he has generally been supposed to have been. Though by no means devoid of tact, he could show great firmness when an important principle was at stake. The part he played in the controversy with the Roman Catholics during the reign of James II and his opposition to the wishes of William and Anne, when he thought he could not conscientiously comply with them, amply prove this. Secondly, Dr Carpenter has told us much about Tenison as an administrator. It is regrettable and not to the credit of those responsible that Dr Carpenter found it "impossible to get access to records from the Bishop of London's Registrar." Tenison was Archdeacon of London for nearly two and a half years, and it would be highly interesting to know how he discharged his duties. What Dr Carpenter has to say about Tenison as an administrator in his episcopal and archi-episcopal capacities is new and important, though the full significance of his account will not be apparent until there have been a number of similar studies of other of Tenison's episcopal contemporaries. Dr Carpenter, indeed, has stuck pretty closely to the story of Tenison's life and has tended to neglect his times. To say this is not to imply that this book should have been turned into an attempt at a general history—a biography cannot be that—but to indicate that, in the opinion of at least one reader, a clearer picture of Tenison's environment would have conduced to a better understanding of Tenison himself. For instance, a comparison between Tenison's writings and those of other prominent divines would be worth making. Again, one would like to know how far Tenison's interest in certain types of charity was typical. Thirdly, more could have been said about the ecclesiastical projects of Frederick I of Prussia. By confining himself to what is available in English, Dr. Carpenter has missed an opportunity.

Occasionally, his opinions may challenge dissent. Some of the alterations Tenison wished to make in the Prayer Book are note-

worthy and something more than the product of a "liberal if rather literal mind." It is of some importance that Tenison wished to delete descriptions of the sovereign as "most religious." It is of considerable importance that in the prayer for the King he wished to substitute "Prosper all his righteous undertakings against Thy enemies" for "Strengthen him that he may vanquish and overcome all his enemies." The man who suggested these changes was not a worshipper of the State, even if that State was ruled by a Protestant. The Glorious Revolution has sometimes been depicted as the cause of a long period of ecclesiastical decadence and subservience to the temporal power; those who may still be tempted to portray it in these colours will do well to ponder Dr Carpenter's story of Tenison's life before they succumb to the temptation.

Mark A. Thomson.

Liverpool University.

The Wholeness of the Church. By Oliver Tomkins. S.C.M. Press. 5s.

One of the most noteworthy features of the Amsterdam Assembly has been the absence of trumpetings, campaigns, follow-ups, and other excursions without which the Church of these days seems unable to move upon its wordy way. This book is also under the restraint of the Spirit. There is a fine patience about it which speaks of faith. Thus it can dare not to be hortative; the unmapped paths to which it points are genuinely there; the cleavages are honestly uncovered and they are the cleavages that matter. "Christian opinion is divided" is a phrase which recurs and always the division is of a stature of which Christian opinion need not be ashamed. Seldom, indeed, can so fair a book have been written by so convinced an author, for there is an undercurrent of passion. There is also observant humour. "Sometimes," writes Mr Tomkins, "we are rather romantic about one another before we meet." Many readers will chuckle over memories as they take this shrewd and important point.

But chiefly this book is excellent for the seriousness with which, like the New Testament, it treats the Local Church. The Local Church as the essential living component and microcosm of ecumenicity is its central theme. Here is a hard fact which has to be advertised and expounded in season, out of season, for a hard fact it is. Mr Tomkins expounds it with a wealth of practicable suggestions, and the busy reader will be grateful that he has both disciplined himself to experience and fledged his ideas before he has let them out of the nest. Each sentence is rewarding.

The least satisfactory part of his thesis is the section entitled The Ecumenical Temper, for this temper would seem to consist too largely in sharing the presuppositions of the particular coterie to which both Mr Tomkins and the present reviewer belong. Is there not a red light to be seen in his own remark that biblical theology is "to-day the fashion"? To call the World Council of Churches, as

one enthusiast has lately called it, an ecclesiastical League of Nations is already to date it, and it may be as undesirable to peg it down to the theological present as to associate it with the political past. We confess that we greatly dislike the phrase, "To be fully ecumenical is to——" But this is a danger which Mr Tomkins clearly sees. Of those who would lay too much stress on "the quite distinct personal experience" that has come to them in the ecumenical movement, he writes that "the unity that they claim on the basis of experience may be nothing more than psychological affinity, the 'clicking' of minds already congenial." On a position so uncongenial to himself as fundamentalism, he can comment with a genuine liberalism that is seldom found in more avowedly liberal quarters.

This is probably the best book that has yet been written about the ecumenical movement, and should be read both by those who are unhappy about it and those who are unduly happy.

WIGAN. FRANK BENNETT.

THE REVISION OF THE PSALTER. An essay in liturgical reform. By Harold Riley. S.P.C.K. 8s. 6d.

THE BROADCAST PSALTER. Selections from the Psalter, together with twelve canticles as used by the B.B.C. S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.

ST ATHANASIUS ON THE PSALMS. Translated by a religious of C.S.M.V. Mowbrays. 1s. 6d.

(The reviewer can express himself only dialectically. To Damœtas, an elderly priest in his book-lined study, enters the younger Palæmon, with three books under his arm.)

Palæmon. What do you think about revising the Psalter?

Damœtas. The Church has always been too conservative there; witness the fate of St Jerome's, the best of all the ancient versions.

P. The Vulgate?

D. No, indeed! The Psalter bound up with the Vulgate is the Gallican, nothing more than the old Latin, from the Septuagint, with a few corrections by Jerome. His own version, an entirely new translation from the Hebrew text extant in his day, was put into cold storage. However, in 1945 the Roman Church brought out the Vatican Psalter, a new version from a corrected Hebrew text. It is an advance on the R.V. or on Moffatt. But it isn't receiving the welcome it deserves.

P. Very interesting, and perhaps symptomatic of the fate of all revisions! And what about Coverdale?

D. Well, of course, critically speaking, he is absurd. Eclectic, sometimes blundering, a capricious translator of translations.

P. Not of the Hebrew?

D. Not at all. He translated "Out of Douche" (German, that is) "and Latine," using "five sundry interpreters"—a little Luther and Vulgate, and more from Zwingli's Zurich Bible and Sanctes Pagninus' new Latin version. Yet Coverdale is a well of English undefiled.

P. And cries out for a revision. But listen now. Mr Harold Riley has an architectural arrangement instead of our haphazard recitation of the Psalter. He divides up the longer Psalms, and by a bit of uncoupling and shunting gets some, like 4 and 141, into their proper evening position. Then he has the Venite and four Psalms for Matins, and five for Evensong.

D. Sounds like a genuine improvement.

P. He's new tables of Proper Psalms, and prefers singing an antiphon to the reading of a brief expository introduction.

D. The fellow must have some liturgical sense.

P. He drops the alternatives to the three canticles of the Incarnation.

D. I begin to be impressed.

P. Then for week-days he has six canticles as alternatives to the Te Deum.

D. (seizing the book). Excellent. Let me see. Yes, a bit like the Vatican Breviary. But what's this? Urbs Fortitudinis, Isaiah xxvi, 1-4, 7-8. Why leave out 5-6? Aren't the footsteps of the needy to tread down the lofty city? You might as well expurgate the Magnificat!

P. Showed strength with his arm . . . scattered the proud. Yes, the omission gives it a horrible air of petit-bourgeois complacency.

D. I'm not a socialist like you. However, we can say so far passed unanimously with acclamation, and one minor amendment.

P. Now for the translation. Mr Riley has 2,000 changes.

D. Alas, my poor unicorns! Are they now buffaloes?

P. Wild oxen.

D. Smells to me of high treason. But they can't touch the lion.

P. You've Riley, I'll take the B.B.C.

D. Let's try lxxxiv, 1. How *lovely* are thy dwellings . . . 2 . . . for thy courts. H'm. . . .

P. Ditto, but in 3, As the sparrow that hath found her nest . . . 4 . . . so have I sought thy altars.

D. 5. Blessed are the men . . . hugh . . . 6 . . . make of it a well; yea the early rain covereth it with blessings. That's R.V. And 7 . . . shall see the God of gods in Zion.

P. B.B.C. leaves us the pools. But in 11 they have thousands of gold and silver, and grace and glory in 12. Now let's try the Te Deum.

D. We praise thee, our God; we acknowledge thee to be our Lord.

P. ". . . who art God, we confess thee who art the Lord" and also "who art the Father." But there are a lot of changes here, far more than you have.

D. In the Psalms they seem to have conspired together, like Westcott and Hort.

P. Yes, the B.B.C. used Mr Riley's version, and also consulted a distinguished Hebraist. But the canticles are by Professor Ratcliff.

D. Yes, very scholarly, but excessively modernized. Both are very scholarly. It couldn't be better done, but . . . hemhaschchasch. . . . (A sinister silence.)

P. Well, you have put on your black cap, so pronounce sentence.

D. Ith es Korakas, Sinon! Your Trojan horse is a very neat and ingenious piece of wood-carving, but it won't replace our Palladium of Parian marble.

P. But at least the more conservative version . . .

D. Bacon's phrase, "As it addeth deformity to an ape to be so like a man so the similitude of superstition to religion makes it the more deformed," applies here, as to the R.V. and A.V.

P. Double-edged. Isn't Coverdalolatry to be identified with superstition? And why object to phrases unless you can suggest improvements on them?

D. I am not competing. If any man alive were capable of reproducing Coverdale's rhythms, he would be sure to regard the original as sacrosanct.

P. Which original? What about the Hebrew?

D. The Moderns are electroplate, he old silver, they are Cape vintages, he is old wine, and we have excellent authority for saying the old wine is better.

P. He who said it put it into the mouth of the scribes, didn't He? But at least tell me which version you prefer.

D. Sir, I shall not attempt to settle the point of precedence between . . .

P (who also knows his Boswell). *No*, not that!

D. Very well, I withdraw what I never said, if it pleases you.

P. I verily believe that, if Coverdale were to descend from heaven bringing a new correct version he had himself prepared after consultation with the spirit of David, Moses, Solomon, Asaph, Ethan, and all the Psalmists, you would reject it with loathing in favour of what you call the original.

D. I love it even to its misprints. And, anyway, I doubt if they would allow him to make any changes!

P. You are a true conservative, who believes nothing ought to be done for the first time.

D. Difficilis, querulus, laudator, temporis acti, I remain adamant, were I to suffer the fate of Laocoon.

P. Ah, well, Mr Riley's work has already won success, in so far as it has been adopted by the B.B.C. But, thanks to obstructionists like yourself, the Church is likely to be more cautious.

D. The most cautious revision would be to me as vinegar to the teeth and as smoke to the eyes.

P. Now, to change the subject, here is a very nice little book; cheap, but beautifully produced. It is *St Athanasius on the Psalms* in a very competent and readable translation. We are recalled to the unity of the Scripture, and to the spiritual interpretation of the Psalter, and from the atmosphere of controversy to that of devotion.

C. W. Quin.

Killinagh Rectory,
Co. Cavan.

ELIZABETH'S FIRST ARCHBISHOP. By F. J. Shirley. S.P.C.K. 2s.

Four years ago a small stir was caused by the publication of a book by Mr J. C. Whitebrook, a Roman Catholic layman, entitled *The Consecration of the Most Reverend Matthew Parker*, which had an original and startling thesis to propound. This was that the traditional story of Archbishop Parker's consecration on December 17, 1559, by Bishop Barlow and his associates is an historical fable and that Parker was really consecrated at some date before October 29 in that year by Anthony Kitchen, Bishop of Llandaff (the one Marian bishop not deprived by Elizabeth) according to the rite of the medieval Pontifical. It was all the more strange that Mr Whitebrook evidently accepted the official Roman Catholic teaching that the Anglican Ordinal is a defective rite, so that, although holding that Parker was validly consecrated, he maintained that the Apostolic Succession was lost later by the Church of England. He was not therefore attempting a defence of Anglican Orders, and his book might be supposed to be inspired by detached zeal for truth. His evidence was subjected to authoritative criticism at the time, but Dr Shirley's scholarly examination of it in the light of record material has been done at leisure and may be regarded as disposing of the mare's nest. His pamphlet, the small size of which is incommensurate with the labour of research which lies behind it, is a most valuable contribution. Dr Shirley is able to show that unpublished Canterbury MSS do not support Mr Whitebrook's view that Parker counted his years of consecration from October and not from December, and he has checked Mr Whitebrook's use of Parker's Probate Registers and shown that they do not bear out the conclusions drawn from them. He has also drawn attention to the *Sede Vacante* Register, preserved at Canterbury, in which the Dean and Chapter's acts as guardians of the spiritualities of the archbishopric are recorded from Pole's death in 1558 to *December*, 1559. If Parker was in fact consecrated some two months earlier than is usually supposed, could the Dean and Chapter have continued to have administered the see unchallenged? This argument is not quite conclusive against Whitebrook, for he maintained that Parker was secretly consecrated before the confirmation of his election on December 9, 1559, and the *Sede Vacante* Register terminates on December 8, in accordance with the legal principle that the vacancy of a see ends with the confirmation of the new bishop (which gives him his jurisdiction), and not with his consecration (which confers on him the *potestas ordinis*). In itself, therefore, it is no evidence for the traditional date of consecration on December 17. But the whole hypothesis of a clandestine and illegal consecration *before* the election was confirmed is so improbable in itself, that one may regard the evidence of the Register as in general corroborative. Dr Shirley completes his driving of nails into Mr Whitebrook's coffin by showing, from a book at Lambeth and an MS at Corpus Christi, Cambridge, that Mr Whitebrook has misstated the evidence to be drawn from Parker's own account of his life. Comparison of the original

MS shows that he has also misread Machyn's Diary. So we need no rewrite history in the way Mr Whitebrook desired.

THOMAS M. PARKER.

PUSEY HOUSE,
OXFORD.

THE DEGREES AND HOODS OF THE WORLD'S UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES. 4th Edition revised by E. W. S. Stringer, M.R.S.T. Cheshunt Press. 32s. 6d.

In 1923 the late Frank W. Haycraft, who was an accountant and part-time organist, brought out a little paper-covered book entitled *The Degrees and Hoods of the World's Universities and Colleges* (pp. 60). It seems to have escaped notice at the time that this was based on and was, for all practical purposes, a copy of an earlier book, *The Degrees, Gowns, and Hoods of the British, Colonial, Indian, and American Universities and Colleges*, by the late Rev. Thomas William Wood, Vicar of Eldersfield, Worcestershire (London: Thomas Pratt and Son, 1882, pp. 36). It was copied practically page for page, and even certain critical sentences in Wood's Introduction appeared word for word in Haycraft's "Preface." No acknowledgment of any kind was paid by Haycraft to Wood's original work. Wood did not die until 1910, so his copyright would extend until 1960.

A 2nd Edition followed (in cloth), pp. 84, in 1924, and a 3rd Edition (in cloth), pp. 101, in 1927: a roneoed paper-covered *Supplement* was issued privately in November, 1930. The writer gave considerable help to Haycraft for his 2nd and 3rd editions, and he had expressed the hope (in letters) that the writer would collaborate with him in preparing a 4th Edition. The war 1939-45, and the unfortunate death of the author in July, 1945, rendered this impossible. Haycraft confined his treatment in the book to *Hoods* only, and eliminated gowns.

Although the Lists of Hoods given in the 4th Edition by E. W. S. Stringer are generally useful, they are by no means infallible—*e.g.*, on p. 16 he states that the new B.Phil. Oxford hood is "*dark* blue lined with white silk," whereas on p. 129 he states that this hood is of "blue lined with white fur"! Neither is correct. Douglas Veale, the Registrar at Oxford, kindly informed me in 1947 that the B.Phil. hood at present was to be the same as the B.Litt.—viz., "light blue corded Ottoman silk lined with white fur." The Degrees he gives in Music for London and Durham are incorrect, and the hood he gives for a London B.Mus., Member of Convocation, is also incorrect (it is lined throughout with white *watered* silk).

In his Introduction, pp. 1-10, which is factually incorrect, in places ungrammatical and badly put together, Stringer shows that he has little knowledge of the origin of universities, of degrees, or of academical dress. Pp. 1-6 are so incorrect that it is impossible to correct them in detail. This section was dealt with authoritatively by the writer in *Oxford*, Winter No., 1946/7, pp. 78-85 (No. 2, Vol. IX).

His attack on p. 7 on continental degrees, and M.D.s of continental universities, is quite unwarranted. The robes worn by British graduates of Göttingen, and by British M.D.s of Brussels, have been duly authorized over sixty years. The M.D. Lausanne robes (for British and U.S. practitioners) were *not* invented by the Graduates Association, and the term "Virgin Mary blue" has never been used. This silk, described by Ede and Ravenscroft as "watered Virgin blue silk" is unique, and was duly approved by the Chancellor "for the lining of the hood ('Capuchon rouge') and for the facing of the robe, to be worn by British M.D.s of Lausanne in accordance with British customs," and the silk was stamped with the university seal and returned to the robemakers for safe custody, who still hold it. In any case Doctors (of a university) in England are entitled to wear scarlet robes, by Act of Parliament, 24 Henry VIII, Caput 13 (1533).

It is notable that Stringer describes himself as a B.A., but does not (perhaps advisedly) disclose the source of the degree. His English, as revealed on p. 6, lines 12-13, is not of matriculation standard.

In his "Addenda" Stringer gives an incorrect description of the new and lovely Chichester Theological College hood (designed and thought out by the writer at the Lord Bishop's request in November last): the cape is rounded. Throughout the book wherever the word "tippet" is used Stringer means "cape." He seems not to realize that the medieval Hood consisted of three parts, a semi-circular shoulder cape, a hood (cowl), and a tail or tippet ("liripipium"). Stringer mistranslates "liripipium" "*l*aripipe." It is the tail or tippet of the hood that is square, the cape should be rounded. The modern academical hood to-day still consists of cape, hood, and liripipe.

The illustrations, though not correct in all cases, are a great improvement on those in the 3rd Edition, but it is unfortunate that Stringer (who runs the book as an exclusive family affair) should have rushed the book out before every possible form of expert assistance in making it correct had been utilized. The whole book needs drastic revision.

Charles A. H. Franklyn.

Bedell of Convocation,
University of London.

The Public Schools To-day. By J. F. Wolfenden. University of London Press. 4s. 6d.

Anyone who has sat under Mr Wolfenden's chairmanship at educational meetings, as for instance of the Headmasters' Conference, knows what to expect from him—limpid statement, fair and balanced acknowledgment of factors on both sides, incisive presentation of vexed questions, seasoned, sometimes with purely naughty grandiloquence, always with apt quotation and ready wit! Here, in this little book on "The Public Schools" we have them all: a philosopher of distinction, who has spent fifteen years running public schools, is thinking aloud. He burks no issue, he shirks no inconvenient question. A parent in genuine doubt whether to sell out and send his son to boarding school will here find the relevant con-

siderations justly marshalled. He will not be dragooned into hi conclusion, but I shall not be surprised if he is persuaded that th public school has something to give that is well worth all one' savings. Indeed, the middle section would seem to be written speci fically for parents who perhaps now for the first time find a publi school education for their son or daughter within the bounds o practical politics. One wonders, however, what such readers ar going to make of "epiphenomenon" (p. 56), or "omphaloscepsis (p. 108)! But these "naughtinesses" are atoned for by the aptness o the writer's illustrations and examples.

It would be all wrong to speak of "a public schools question"— there isn't one, and there couldn't be one, where all the terms ar so impossible of definition. But Mr Wolfenden is in a uniqu position to have a wide grasp of the issue at stake, of the question people are asking about the public schools; and he has given a clea statement of their present position, aims, and achievements. H points the way ahead towards further development in institutions which, for all that they have been called hide-bound and reaction ary, have in actual fact as far-reaching, as swift, and almost as lon an evolutionary history as the Constitution itself.

In this survey it may seem strange to some that so very littl attention is paid to what many regard as the primary business i education, the formal instruction. There is not a word about sylla bus, or the place of the latest invaders of the time-table, or the que tion of specialization, or teaching methods. This is because M Wolfenden has addressed himself solely to the comparison of board ing school with day school; and it is fair to assume that the course of instruction in both are identical.

Again and again he emphasizes the primacy of the spiritual facto in education. "Public school religion" has often been called i question: the Headmaster of Shrewsbury is not blind to the weak nesses often intended by that phrase. But he is not one to forget i a welter of administrative memoranda, budgets, statistics, and ne examinations that people matter, and each one matters because h is an immortal soul in the making. "That a school or its member may often fall short of full Christian living should surprise nobody the point is that they daily renew their efforts and daily submi themselves to judgment by the highest standards they know."

RONALD LUNT.

LIVERPOOL.

SHORTER NOTICES

AN OUTLINE OF CHRISTIAN SOCIOLOGY. By W. G. Peck. Jame Clarke. 6s.

Canon A. E. Baker, in his editorial preface, modestly describes th "Theology for Modern Men" series, of which this is the first volume as "handbooks for adult religious education classes." Dr Peck's boo deserves a wider audience than this, although for the student o

some sophistication it should fulfil its primary purpose admirably. It focuses attention upon and challenges the assumptions underlying some of those aspects of contemporary society which the social conscience of the Christian is too apt to accept as inescapable data, as raw material upon the basis of which redemption and reform must do their work. We are given, together with some consideration of its relevance to political thought, an analysis of economic relationships and their resultant institutional forms which is both a stimulating critique of professional economic theory and a trenchant commentary upon accepted interpretations of economic history.

Outside this sphere Dr Peck has little to say, and his book would be none the worse for that did it not purport to be, as his title indicates, a general survey of what he calls "Christian Sociology." Rational discussion of the meaning and implications of this phrase is long overdue, and Dr Peck, while recognizing its controversial character, justifies its use mainly on the ground that it "appears to have come to stay." Without entering this arena, and however we may interpret the relation between this noun and its qualifying adjective, we are at least entitled to expect that the author will provide some material for the understanding of society in its non-economic aspects. It is surely essential to even the briefest outline that some attention should be devoted, if not to the more difficult problems of the dynamics of social change, at least to the relationships and institutions of the family, the church, the neighbourhood, and the like. Since we cannot imagine that this is an oversight, we are left to the strange conclusion that the author, although an informed anti-Marxist, yet subscribes to the Marxian hypothesis that the economic is the dominating factor in social structure and a reorientation of economic life the fundamental prerequisite of a better order.

Rosemary Frost.

The University,
Liverpool.

The Origins of Religion. By Lord Raglan. Watts ("Thinker's Library"). 2s. 6d.

Some volumes in the "Thinker's Library," sponsored by the Rationalist Press Association, are less dogmatically anti-religious or anti-Christian than others. This is one of them. Lord Raglan here gives a simple—perhaps too simple—critical survey of widely accredited views of scholars, mainly anthropologists and psychologists, on the main aspects of religion as a human phenomenon. He does not regard religion as natural to man, and thinks that historical and not psychological inquiry is alone likely to reveal its origin. Yet if religion is not natural to man but simply a social institution, this in no way says anything to its detriment, and must necessarily suggest that every other human activity, *e.g.*, art and science, is equally unnatural. Again, it would seem wiser to envisage the historical and psychological methods as complementary rather than alternative.

Lord Raglan has, however, gathered together into a short space

much of interest to those seeking simplified anthropological information on religion; but he does not go on to tackle the much more interesting and vital question of the truth or falsehood of religion or religions. Perhaps he regards this as a fruitless pursuit. Yet it is difficult to see the point of this intellectual luxury, only too prevalent in these so-called "scientific" days, of gathering data unless it is in the hope that it will help in man's insatiable quest.

The author's conclusion, which has found expression before, that "originally and in essence religions have always been systems of action, never mere systems of belief," deserves more attention than it has generally been accorded, not so much because it is the right conclusion but because he has over-emphasized a side of religion which scholars have understandably tended to overlook. Having, however, agreed that action, largely in the shape of ritual, is of great importance in religion, one must then go on to ask why this should be the case. To treat of religion scientifically without entering the realm of philosophical and theological inquiry is rather like stamp collecting without reference to the geography and history of the countries of issue—satisfying to those who merely want to collect but not to the real philatelist.

D. W. Gundry.

Bangor.

Royal Pearl. The Life and Times of Margaret Queen of Scotland. By A. M. D. Henderson-Howat. S.P.C.K. 10s. 6d.

Margaret of Scotland, Queen and saint, occupies an important place in the development of Scotland towards full incorporation into the life of western Christendom. She has therefore received much attention from historians, whose estimates of her character and achievement have varied, Mrs Henderson-Howat thinks, "according to their ecclesiastical, national, or cultural bias." Historians certainly have their weaknesses. Fortunately, if we are unable to go over their material critically for ourselves, we can select those whose bias is most congenial to us. This book does not profess to be serious history, but to be an attempt to paint a picture "as the artist conceives it." And, indeed, an attractive picture emerges of a good woman, devoutly pious, gently cultured, full of lofty aims, good works, and, it must be confessed, rather commonplace modern sentiments beloved of the more popular novelists. We cannot but love this lady of many exiles who came to be the sweet châtelaine of Malcolm Canmore's rude tower, and a civilizing influence in his life, in that of his court, and, in lesser degree, of his kingdom. Nevertheless, it would be hard to agree with Bishop How, who in the Preface writes that "Mrs Henderson-Howat has certainly succeeded in making St Margaret, and the age in which she lived, come to life." Even as literary romance the book cannot take high rank. It lacks imaginative power, and its style is undistinguished and in places slipshod. What comes to life is the authoress herself. We catch repeated glimpses of her enthusiasm for the Scottish landscape, her love of artistic objects, of medieval architecture and pageantry, her

deprecating attitude towards philistines and other "unpleasant persons," and her loyalty to the Scottish Episcopal Church, curiously identified with the Church of St Margaret. The presbyterian system seems to be the only "foreign imposition" in which she does not delight; unless we are to add the Roman jurisdiction, which, she cryptically remarks in passing, did not exist in Britain till "long after Margaret's time and then only for a very brief period"!

John H. S. Burleigh.

University of Edinburgh.

Kirchenzucht bei Zwingli. By Roger Ley. (Quellen und Abhandlungen zur Geschichte des Schweizerischen Protestantismus. 2. Band.) Zwingli-Verlag, Zurich.

The definition of the Church in terms of Word and Sacrament stems from the origin of the Reformation movement. It is the new, third dimension which adds to "Word and Sacrament" the "Discipline of Christ" which sets the main problem of Protestant ecclesiology for the next century, and which incidentally is the real clue to the English Church struggle 1550-1660. In Switzerland, amid a changing political situation, the problems of church autonomy, of the civil magistracy, and of spiritual and legal discipline, gave rise to different theories and different solutions in the cities of Zurich, Basel, and Geneva, and offer striking parallels with the problems and solutions reached a century later among the similarly compact, isolated Puritan settlements in New England. This study is of wider interest, therefore, than that of a paragraph in the history of Swiss Protestantism.

Dr Ley has written a careful and discriminating study. He does not hestitate to affirm Zwingli's limitation, notably an undue emphasis on the prophylactic element in Church discipline as against the New Testament concern for the salvation of the sinner. The assertion of Zwingli, that the Swiss situation was that rather of the prophets than of the apostles, also led the Reformer to an evasion of certain New Testament challenges. He shows how Zwingli's tentative early assertion of the rights of the congregation turned more and more to the clear affirmation of the duty of the Christian magistracy to exercise the discipline of the Church *totius ecclesiæ nomine*, and in this Zwingli reacts sharply against the contrary affirmations of the Anabaptists, or the attempt to formulate some independent form of congregational "Censura" of his friend Œcolampadius at Basel. The change of attitude becomes more sharply marked after 1526. Most striking of all is that, parallel with this, Zwingli changed his mind about the "fencing" of the Lord's Table, and alone among the leading reformers came to exempt this from being a focal point in ecclesiastical discipline. This may be partly due to his eucharistic doctrine ("est ergo eucharistia gratiarum actio, animi exultatio, confessio") and rejection of the corporal presence, though he did affirm that those public sinners who were under judgment from the magistrates for civil offences should be excluded.

The Zurich reformers were driven by their fear of Anabaptists on the one hand and Catholics on the other into a course of acti which led them in 1532 to compulsory baptism and compulsc attendance at the Eucharist! Dr Ley concludes with a useful cate of statements from other Zurich reformers in the next two centur on problems of discipline and on the vexed question of "fenci the Table."

GORDON RUPP.

RICHMOND.

THE EARLIEST CHRISTIAN CONFESSIONS. By Oscar Cullmann. Lu terworth Press. 4s. 6d.

This is a translation of a French book that was reviewed by M C. F. D. Moule in THEOLOGY, April, 1949.

FRANCE PAGAN? THE MISSION OF ABBÉ GODIN. By Maisie War Sheed and Ward. 10s. 6d.

This is an English version of books to which attention was call in THEOLOGY, 1947, pp. 2-9, 210-215.

THE TRIAL OF JESUS CHRIST. By Frank J. Powell. Paternost Press. 6s.

The Jerusalem Supreme Court has, according to an Israeli pre report, lately been asked to review the trial and conviction of Jes Christ, the petitioner being an Englishman who has recently pu lished a book on "jurisprudence." A special interest attaches ther fore to this book by a Metropolitan magistrate, which, after a surv of the Biblical evidence, advances the same plea. Here is a since if somewhat laborious attempt to reassess from the legal angle th Gospel narratives, mainly with the aid of copious extracts from th Mishnah, despite the writer's admission (p. 60) that the latter, as w have it, may be an ideal construction of second-century Rabbis, ar of uncertain value as evidence for the time of Caiaphas. His gener attitude to New Testament criticism is fundamentalist, so that son of his judgments are extremely naive. Thus the disagreement of th witnesses on which the Hebrew "trial" broke down is explain (p. 67) by the textual divergence of Matt. xxvi, 61 and Mark xiv, 5 and the insincerity of the judges is proved by the circumstance th after the Resurrection they did not try "to make contact with Jes to confirm the fact," but bribed the soldiers instead (p. 89). It unfortunate that, by this well-meaning incursion into a field n primarily the author's own, no new light is thrown upon an a mittedly dark and intricate subject, and even the general reader wi we suspect, gain more of the salient truth from the simple direc ness of the Gospel story itself.

G. E. P. Cox.

ST KATHARINE'S COLLEGE,
LIVERPOOL.

THE RESURRECTION IN EZEKIEL XXXVIII AND IN THE DURA-EUROPOS PAINTINGS. By Harald Riesenfeld. Lundequistska Bokhandeln (Uppsala). Kr. 1.50.

This short but detailed study is certainly to be commended. The author argues that whereas Ezekiel xxxvii is a parable of national restoration, its symbolism derives from a contemporary belief in resurrection, which in turn springs from the ritual of the New Year. In later Jewish thought, as evidenced especially by the Dura frescoes, this chapter was interpreted as a "prefiguration of eschatological resurrection." Such exegesis, common to the Fathers, would also seem to underlie Matt. xxvii, 51-3, the coming forth of the saints from their tombs, which the author declares to have been a Messianic sign. The value of this essay is increased by copious footnotes which bring to one's notice the work of many continental theologians who deserve to be better known in this country.

J. G. DAVIES.

THE UNIVERSITY,
BIRMINGHAM.

PONTIFICAL CEREMONIES. By P. Ahearne and M. Lane. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 21s.

This book, which was produced in Ireland, contains directions "for the carrying out of the principal episcopal ceremonies of the Roman Rite which occur in the course of the ecclesiastical year." The Irish are reputed to have little natural aptitude for ecclesiastical ceremonial; but the ceremonies here described are so elaborate that those who are obliged to participate in them, whatever their degree of aptitude, must need to have at hand a detailed guide such as this.

THE LIFE AND TEACHING OF JESUS CHRIST OUR LORD. By Jules Lebreton, S.J. Burns Oates. 21s.

This is a reprint (two volumes in one) of a book that was first published in an English translation in 1934. For a review see THEOLOGY, January, 1935, pp. 61 f.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

ABINGDON-COKESBURY PRESS: Elmer A. Leslie, *The Psalms* ($5.00).
ALLEN AND UNWIN: William Dale Morris, *The Christian Origins of Social Revolt* (12s. 6d.).
EDGAR BACKUS (LEICESTER): T. C. Hunter Clare, *The Voice of Melody* (3s. 6d.).
BEREAN PRESS: P. W. Evans, *Some Lessons from Marcion* (1s. 3d.).
BLACKFRIARS: Ferdinand Valentine, O.P., *For Better For Worse* (5s.); George E. Ekbery, *First Principles of Understanding* (1s. 6d.); G. Michonneau, *Revolution in a City Parish* (7s. 6d.).

BASIL BLACKWELL: Cyril Alington, *Sense and Non-Sense* (7s. 6d.); Gwilym Griffith, *St Paul's Gospel to the Romans* (10s. 6d.).

BRITISH PUBLISHING CO. (GLOUCESTER): An Anglican Tertiary, *The Fruits of Silence* (2s.).

BURNS OATES AND WASHBOURNE: A. D. Sertillanges, O.P., *What Jesus Said from the Cross* (8s. 6d.); Pierce Ahearne and Michael Lane, *Pontifical Ceremonies* (21s.); Jules Lebreton, S.J., *The Life and Teaching of Jesus Christ* (21s.); Christopher Wilmot, S.J., *Lift Up Your Hearts* (7s. 6d.); Joseph Coventry, S.J., *Morals and Independence* (4s. 6d.).

CASTERMAN (TOURNAI): L. De Coninck, S.J., *Problèmes de L'Adaptation Apostolat* (45 frs.).

CHURCH BOOK ROOM PRESS: Albert Mitchell, *Common Prayer* (2s.).

JAMES CLARKE: Frank Buchanan, *The Baptism and Temptation of Christ* (6s.).

EPWORTH PRESS: W. F. Howard, *The Romance of New Testament Scholarship* (7s. 6d.); Eric W. Baker, *A Herald of the Evangelical Revival* (12s. 6d.).

INDEPENDENT PRESS: K. L. Carrick Smith, *Sonship* (1s. 6d.); G. W. J. Camerc Price, *The Mirror of God* (6s.); Angus Watson, *A Bow at a Venture* (8s. 6d.

I.V.F.: G. W. Bromiley, *Reasonable Service* (5s.).

LONGMANS: J. B. Coates, *The Crisis of the Human Person* (12s. 6d.).

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: C. P. Groves, *The Planting of Christianity in Africa* Volume I to 1840 (21s.); D. Johnston Martin, *Ablaze Yet Not Consumed* (8s. 6d.).

MACDONALD AND EVANS: C. B. Mortlock, *Inky Blossoms* (8s. 6d.).

MOWBRAY: Walter Carey, *Helps to Prayer for Boys* (2s.); J. W. C. Wand, *The Authority of the Scriptures* (5s.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: *The Indian Liturgy* (2s.); Percy Dearmer, *The Story of the Prayer Book* (8s. 6d.); H. S. Box, *The Principles of Canon Law* (5s.).

PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED PUBLISHING CO. (PHILADELPHIA): B. Warfield *The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible* ($3.75).

SANDS AND CO.: E. C. Messenger, *Two in One Flesh* (Vol. 1, 6s.; Vol. 2, 10s. 6d Vol. 3, 6s.).

S.C.M. PRESS: Hugh Martin, *Luke's Portrait of Jesus* (6s.); Michael Sim Williams (Ed.), *Religion Through Drama* (8s. 6d.).

SHEED AND WARD: Jean Daniélou, *The Salvation of the Nations* (6s.) [T French original of this book was reviewed in THEOLOGY, December, 194 pp. 384 f.]; John C. Heenan, *They made Me Sign* (5s.).

S.P.C.K.: J. T. Hughes, *Retreats* (8d.); Guy Warman, *Our Prayer Book* (6d A. Tindal Hart, *The Life and Times of John Sharp, Archbishop of Yo* (21s.).

S.P.C.K. AND NATIONAL SOCIETY: A. J. Watts, *No New Thing* (11s. 6d.).

WATTS AND CO.: J. W. Poynter, *The Popes and Social Problems* (7s. 6d Martin Davidson, *The Church Looks at Herself* (7s. 6d.); Archibald Robe son, *Church and People in Britain* (7s. 6d.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher

HEFFER'S of CAMBRIDGE

will pay good prices for

THEOLOGICAL BOOKS

especially the following:

Andrewes (Lancelot). Works; **Biblia Sacra Vulgata**, good editions; **Darlow & Moule.** Bible Society Catalogue; **Edersheim.** Jesus the Messiah, 2 vols; **Harnack.** History of Dogma; **Julian's Dictionary of Hymnology; Kierkegaard.** Any books; **Lightfoot.** All commentaries; **Ramsay (W.M.).** Any books; **Robertson.** Grammar of New Testament Greek; **Schurer.** Jewish People in the time of Christ; **Schweitzer.** Any books; **Adam Smith.** Jerusalem, 2 vols; **Stone.** History of the Doctrine of the Eucharist; **Streeter.** Four Gospels; **Swete.** St. Mark and Apocalypse of St. John; **Temple.** All major works; **Thackeray.** Grammar of Old Testament Greek; **Underhill.** Mysticism; **Westcott.** St. John's Gospel; **Westcott.** Epistles of St. John; **Westcott.** Hebrews; **Law (Wm).** Works, 9 vols; **Lightfoot.** Apostolic Fathers; **Moulton & Geden.** Concordance to Greek New Testament.

and for standard books on any subject

W. HEFFER & SONS LIMITED

PETTY CURY

C A M B R I D G E

TWO REPRINTS

Gilbert Keith Chesterton

By Maisie Ward **25/- net**

Here is the long-awaited reprint of this famous biography. "Maisie Ward's *Gilbert Keith Chesterton* is an admirable biography and will be the source-book of many lives yet to come." ROBERT LYND in *News Chronicle*

The Complete Works of St Teresa

Translated and Edited by Professor E. Allison Peers

£3 3s. net per set of three volumes

"In this new translation of Saint Teresa, Professor Allison Peers has set a crown on the splendid work he has already done to make the writings of the Spanish mystic available in English." *Irish Independent*

SHEED & WARD, LTD

110-111 FLEET STREET, LONDON, E.C.4

PAROCHIAL SERMONS OF BISHOP CHAVASSE

Second Series: FROM TRINITY TO ADVENT

Edited by H. D. S. SWEETAPPLE, D.D. 9s. 6d.

This is the second volume of *The Parochial Sermons of Bishop Chavasse*. To make a complete course for every Sunday and Red Letter Saint's Day, the editor supplies two sermons of his own. Many besides those who knew and revered Bishop Chavasse will be grateful for this collection.

THE LIFE OF T. B. STRONG

BISHOP, MUSICIAN, DEAN, VICE-CHANCELLOR

By HAROLD ANSON, Master of the Temple 8s. 6d.

This is a book about Victorian Oxford, just when the old clerical Dons were vanishing, and a new type was emerging. T. B. Strong was one of the most brilliant and amusing personalities of his day in Oxford University life; a leader among new and brilliant Liberal High Churchmen, and a keen and competent musician.

MEDIEVAL MONASTERIES AND MINSTERS

By H. E. ROBERTS 12s. 6d.

Here is a concisely summarised, yet full and reliable, description of all the interesting monastic remains in England, with a careful classification according to the order of their foundation. This is prefixed by a succinct description of a typical medieval monastery, fully illustrated with photographs designed to impress upon the reader's mind what each part of a monastic building was like, by means of a reproduction of a well-preserved example.

MARCION AND HIS INFLUENCE

By E. C. BLACKMAN 12s. 6d.

Mr. Blackman, in this scholarly and well-documented study, considers, from the more dispassionate viewpoint of to-day, Marcion's work as the organiser of a Christian Church, as Biblical critic, canon-maker, textual emendator, and theologian. He has attempted to trace the effect of Marcion's work in the larger context of Catholic Christianity, and presents an estimate of Marcion's significance in the history of Christianity.

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF JOHN SHARP

ARCHBISHOP OF YORK

By A. TINDAL HART 21s.

This biography of Archbishop John Sharp should place all interested in English history under a great debt. It is bound to be the classical study of Sharp for many years to come, and it has the merit—not always shared by works of this kind—of being most interestingly written. The general reader as well as the historian will enjoy it.

(*Published for the Church Historical Society*)

THE PILGRIM'S PROGRESS

A Complete Dramatization

By RODNEY BENNETT 2s. 9d.

Out of Rodney Bennett's devoted experience, and under his guiding hand, comes a version of *The Pilgrim's Progress* that amateur groups will delight to translate into vigorous and effective action.

(*Published for the Religious Drama Society*)

S · P · C · K

Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2